REMARKS

1. The Examiner's Objections and Rejections

Claims 1-10 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,327,343 (Epstein hereinafter). Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epstein in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US/2001/0044724 A1 (Hon hereinafter). Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epstein in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,350,066 (Bobo hereinafter). Claim 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epstein in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,568,540 (Greco hereinafter).

2. The Claims Are Patentably Distinct over Primary Reference Epstein

The multiple rejections based on Epstein will be addressed collectively hereinafter since Epstein alone and/or in combination with any of the other references cited does not teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as claimed. The present invention is directed to a simple and elegant system whereby a user is able to view, search and gist through voicemail messages through a dedicated intuitive user interface. The present invention is predicated on the provision of this user interface which provides the user with the ability to easily find and view critical information within the messages, i.e. "The user interface may include a window or screen where the transcribed text of the voicemail messages are displayed. Certain message information such as the name of the caller, date of the call and time of the call can be displayed in a separate window or screen. A search window is integrated into the user interface to allow the user to specify certain search criteria for the user. The user interface of the present invention may be implemented as a stand-alone computer or may be part of a global information network such as the World Wide Web." Spec. p. 3, lines 1-8; also see FIGS. 4, 5 and 6. The present invention as

claimed specifically includes such "a user interface for providing the identified selected information" (see, for example, Claim 1).

Clearly, such a dedicated interface for browsing and gisting messages is not in any way contemplated in Epstein. What Epstein really discloses is merely a programming interface for ***programming*** the system, i.e. "...a user may program the system 10 using the programming interface 38 through either voice commands or a GUI (graphical user interface, or both)." Col. 6, lines 13-16. Epstein further goes on to discuss "It is to be appreciated that the system 10 may be ***programmed*** through a combination of voice commands and a GUI. In such a situation, the GUI may, for example, provide assistance to the user in giving the requisite voice commands to ***program*** the system 10. Col. 6, lines 36-40. Epstein repeats this again "The process of ***programming*** the system 10 can be performed wither, locally, via a GUI interface or voice command..." Col. 12, lines 18-20. Epstein goes so far as to actually claim this programming interface, i.e. "Claim 14. The system of claim 1, wherein said ***programming means*** includes one of a GUI interface, a voice interface, a programming configuration files, and a combination thereof."

Not only does Epstein state that the GUI is used for programming the system, Epstein further emphasizes that such a GUI is NOT a preferred way to accomplish such programming. Epstein clearly states a dispreference for using a GUI to program the system, i.e. "In a preferred embodiment, the system 10 is programmed by verbal commands from the user. (i.e., voice command mode). " Col. 6, lines 17-18. Epstein further discloses that "The preferred method of ***programming*** the system 10 is through voice activated command via a process of speech recognition and natural language understanding, **as opposed** to DTMF keying or via GUI interface." Col. 12, lines 39-43. Thus, Epstein repeatedly states throughout the disclosure that a GUI is not even a preferable way of ***programming*** the system.

Now referring to the Office Action dated May 22nd, the Examiner cites Col. 14, lines 11-13 of Epstein ("It is to be appreciated that information may be retrieved from the

audio indexer, prioritizer module 34 through various methods such as via GUI interface, PINs and DTMF Keying.") for the proposition that Epstein teaches the use of a GUI as disclosed in the present invention. However, given the aforementioned detailed discussion of the programming GUI in Epstein it can only reasonably be surmised that all Epstein really teaches is a GUI for ***programming*** the system, and for that matter, not even a preferable way to program the system, i.e. to reiterate "...a user may program the system 10 using the programming interface 38 through either voice commands or a GUI (graphical user interface, or both). In a preferred embodiment, the system 10 is programmed by verbal commands from the user. (i.e., voice command mode). " Col. 6, lines 13-18. Thus, clearly, all Epstein teaches and discloses is a less preferred programming GUI and not an interface for browsing and gisting messages as disclosed in the present invention.

Accordingly, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the various rejections based on Epstein as a primary reference are improper and must be withdrawn.

3. Conclusion

The rejections are deemed to be respectfully traversed and the claims allowable over the prior art. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendments and remarks and favorable action in connection with this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 to AT&T Corp. Account No. 01-2745. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (908) 221-5430 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9-19-02

Cedric G. DeLaCruz
Registration No. 36,498